

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE MEETING

January 11, 2006

Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions	1
Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP)	1
Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).....	4
Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF)	5
Update on B/C Cribs.....	6
Canyon Disposition Initiative (CDI) Record of Decision (ROD)	7
Land Disposal Restrictions (LDR) Materials in the 100 Areas	8
300 Area D&D Update	9
Comprehensive Environmental Responsibility, Liability and Compensation Act (CERCLA) 5-year Review.....	10
Committee Business.....	10
Action Items / Commitments	11
Handouts	12
Attendees.....	12

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Welcome and Introductions

Maynard Plahuta, Chair of the River and Plateau Committee (RAP), welcomed the committee and introductions were made. The committee adopted the November meeting summary with proposed changes.

Matt McCormick, Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), introduced Dave Brockman, federal project director for the K Basin Closure project.

Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP)

Stacey Charboneau, DOE-RL, presented an update on the decision whether to retrofit the PFP facility or build a new plutonium storage facility. She discussed the project objectives given the new direction for long-term surveillance and maintenance (S&M) storage. Current decommissioning and demolition (D&D) activities include tearing down the 232-Z incinerator and the 241-Z treatment and storage facilities. DOE will achieve D&D of 241-Z by September 30, 2006 in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) milestone and plans to complete 241-Z D&D in fiscal year 2007.

Stacey explained that DOE has not engaged in full scale D&D of the PFP because special nuclear materials remain. DOE has not missed any PFP milestones to date and are on track to meet the TPA D&D schedule for the PFP. However, since a national plutonium consolidation strategy has not been established, new security and storage directives apply at the PFP. For this reason, DOE will not achieve the accelerated completion date of 2009, but hopes to achieve the 2016 TPA milestone.

Stacey said DOE recognizes the Hanford Advisory Board's (Board) advice on the issue of long-term plutonium storage. While DOE has not yet sent a response to the Board's advice, Stacey said it will include a discussion of the new Nuclear Materials Consolidation Committee, which was established to consider national plutonium consolidation. She indicated Hanford's plutonium material is the highest priority for consolidation. Since it is very costly to store plutonium material at Hanford, DOE is considering a planning case that involves shipping plutonium material to a consolidation facility in the next three to four years.

Stacey said DOE has reevaluated options for either modifying the 241-Z facility or constructing a new facility for long-term plutonium storage. She said a value engineering study recommended constructing a new facility because it would provide flexibility in determining a path forward. However, DOE will have to consider its funding options. She said DOE-RL is working with other DOE sites to develop a disposition path for plutonium material so a new facility does not need to be built.

Regulator Perspectives

- Rick Bond, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said Ecology understands DOE's plan for short-term lay-up of the facility until the consolidation of plutonium material can be achieved. However, Ecology is concerned that this lay-up plan has resulted in laying off the trained workforce and DOE-RL will have to retrain the workforce in three or four years. He said Ecology's primary objective is to achieve TPA cleanup milestones, and under the new plan DOE-RL is still on track to meet the TPA milestone at the PFP since they have until 2016 to D&D the PFP complex. Rick said it is still too early for Ecology to be concerned about D&D of the PFP complex since there is still a lot of time for DOE to meet the TPA milestones.
- Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said EPA hopes funding would be available to properly D&D plutonium material, and he encouraged the Board to continue to provide pressure on DOE to adequately fund the work.

Committee Discussion

- The committee discussed communication issues between the DOE-Hanford field offices and the Department of Energy – Headquarters (DOE-HQ). *Did DOE-RL discuss funding issues with DOE-HQ? If so, what was their response?* DOE-RL developed a new baseline funding scenario that showed that it would cost DOE billions of dollars over the next 25 years or so if they do not consolidate the nuclear

materials and move forward soon with D&D of PFP. When DOE saw this scenario, they directed DOE-RL to develop a new baseline with the assumption that consolidation will occur by 2009 and that the TPA milestones for D&D of the PFP complex by 2016 will be met. If DOE-RL decides to construct a new plutonium storage facility, funding would come from a different line item, which involves a longer approval and budget cycle. She said DOE is trying to identify the most cost effective option considering the additional security costs.

Deleted: Stacey said DOE-RL did not express funding concerns based on the Department of Energy – Office of Environmental Management (DOE-EM) budget.

- Greg deBruler commented that inadequate funding for cleanup activities has been a concern of the Board for several years. *If the DOE-Hanford field offices are not communicating these issues to DOE-HQ, how will DOE-HQ get the message that funding is a serious issue?* Stacey said DOE-RL submits all baseline change requests to DOE-HQ. Matt explained that it is a DOE policy that the program offices with line items for special nuclear materials are responsible for the safe storage and security of those materials. He said DOE-EM has nuclear material across the complex that needs to be dealt with.
- Maynard asked whether DOE-RL has discussed funding issues with the Federal Office of Management and Budgets (OMB) to explain that plutonium storage is a significant burden? Matt said the Nuclear Consolidation Committee reports directly to the DOE Under-Secretary.
- The committee discussed the characterization of plutonium material at Hanford. Several committee members expressed concern that the plutonium material at Hanford is not being characterized as waste.
- *Does the Nuclear Consolidation Committee have a charter, and is there a representative from DOE-RL on the committee?* Stacey said the Nuclear Materials Consolidation Committee's charter has been approved, and she would make it available to interested committee members.
- *What is the cost of the PFP complex?* Including maintenance and surveillance costs, Stacy said the total cost of the PFP would be approximately \$110 million, including annual administrative costs of \$30 million and security costs of between \$30 and \$85 million. The significant costs of the PFP are driving DOE-RL to attempt to achieve an accelerated D&D date of 2016 rather than the 2030 TPA milestone date.
- *Vince Panesko asked whether the study of the overall upgrades needed for the ventilation system at the PFP is available for review?* Stacey said DOE-RL is in the middle of putting together a Lay-up Plan for the PFP, which includes all upgrade and maintenance needs. Stacey said she would put together some form of the plan for release to the committee.
- *Vince Panesko asked whether the report on the status of the ventilation plan has been cleared for release?* Stacey was unsure whether the report has been cleared yet.
- *Considering a recent report about criticality violations, has DOE-RL decided to bring in a national review team to evaluate criticality?* Stacey said a national review team performs an annual criticality evaluation at Hanford. She said there are several measures in place to prevent criticality. She indicated the report suggested there were some Technical Safety Requirement (TSR) violations that may not actually have been

criticality issues. Warnings for criticality violations are issued accordingly, and a fee withholding would result if violations are not rectified.

- Rob Davis suggested the committee needs to understand system upgrades and criticality safety equipment issues at the PFP, and should receive updates from DOE-RL.

Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Matt McCormick, DOE-RL, discussed the recent settlement agreement between DOE and Ecology regarding the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS). He referred committee members to the DOE press release for more information. Several committee members commended DOE and Ecology on the settlement agreement and their cooperative attitude.

Committee Discussion

- *Are local communities being involved in remedy selection for the TC&WM EIS?*
Matt said the EIS scoping process would provide opportunities for public participation. Susan Leckband suggested the committee have a discussion about the settlement agreement at the next meeting. She was interested in discussing schedule development for the EIS and the timeline for using the Solid Waste EIS until the TC&WM EIS is complete. Suzanne Dahl, Ecology, said the TC&WM EIS involves at least two tanks projects and waste management projects, so it would span issues considered by several of the Board's committees. Maynard suggested identifying joint issue managers between RAP and the Tank Waste Committee (TWC). Vince and Susan agreed to be issue managers from RAP, and they will review the Board's previous advice on the Solid Waste EIS in conjunction with previous advice on the Tank Closure EIS as a foundation for committee discussion. Todd Martin reminded the agencies that the Board would not be able to provide comment on EIS scoping before the first week of April.
- *Why are DOE and the regulatory agencies confident that developing a new comprehensive EIS from the two existing EISs is appropriate? How confident is DOE that it will be able to complete a new EIS in 18 months?* Suzanne said the existing MOU between Ecology and DOE-ORP fostered an interactive relationship between the agencies on the Tank Closure EIS, enabling them to address assumptions and data packages they do not agree on. To develop the comprehensive scope of the TC&WM EIS, the agencies have already done a lot of work on the Tank Closure EIS and will just have to bring in waste management issues.
- *Referencing a quality assurance (QA) report that was conducted on the HSW-EIS, Vince Panesko asked for the committee to receive updates on recommendations for DOE-RL and Batelle contractor improvements and corrective actions.* Matt said DOE-RL made a commitment to ensure the QA report recommendations are put in place, and the committee could be updated on the corrective actions and improvements.

- *How does the QA report fit into the Control Configurations Report?* Matt said the Technical Review Group (TRG) is responsible for configuration management. Suzanne said Ecology agreed, in the rewritten Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on the status of their cooperating role in the TC&WM EIS, to keep the existing TRG unless things need to be changed in the future. She said a link to the MOU is in the settlement agreement press release.
- Greg commented that the TRG team, which is responsible for determining what is in the TC&WM EIS, does not have a representative from the state of Washington or the state of Oregon. He believes this is significant since the TRG team decides what is, or is not, in an EIS.

Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF)

Suzanne, Ecology, provided an update on the IDF. She said Ecology sent a letter supporting the Board's advice on the IDF, which included a confusing sentence on the need for cumulative analysis. She explained that Ecology was under court order not to discuss cumulative analysis, so the letter was attempting to indicate the need for a cumulative EIS without violating the court order.

Suzanne said Ecology hopes to issue the IDF permit within the next month. She said the permit is for 50 boxes of bulk vitrified waste product and glass product from the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) to be sent to the IDF. Ecology has a series of risk assessment tools for future waste that needs to fit within a risk budget and environmental standards.

Committee Discussion

- *How will the risk budget tool and the TC&WM EIS relate given the TC&WM EIS timeline?* Since development of the risk assessment is an iterative process, Suzanne said the risk assessment for the risk budget will be based on the best available information.
- Gerry said there is an expectation that low-level waste (LLW) would be sent to the IDF. *How will this waste be accounted for since these waste streams will not be sent to the IDF for a while?* Suzanne indicated that one of the reasons Ecology wants to move forward with the permit for the IDF is that the facility is almost constructed and Ecology wants the proper permitting status for a complete facility. Also, Ecology wants the risk tools required in the permit to be developed. Dennis explained that LLW waste would be disposed of at the IDF as soon as the LLW side of the IDF is open. Matt added that LLW is currently disposed of at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF).
- Some committee members expressed concern about the use of DOE's Technical Guidance Document (TGD) in the risk assessment development process. Matt said the TGD process is meant to set consistent parameters for risk assessments. Suzanne said the TGD that controls EIS assumptions is signed by the State of Washington, and Ecology plans to be an involved, cooperating agency in the TC&WM EIS

development process. Ecology is contracting with an outside firm to evaluate groundwater modeling. Dennis added that EPA is also committing resources, including national groundwater modeling experts.

- Since the Solid Waste EIS will be used until the TC&WM EIS is complete, Gerry expressed concern about relying on the Solid Waste EIS for the IDF and other waste management actions. He believes the review of the Solid Waste EIS issued by DOE-HQ shows the analysis is unreliable, and he was disappointed Ecology considers any part of it useful. *He commented that transparency is required to have confidence in any of the EIS analyses, and he asked whether all the documents related to the Solid Waste EIS and groundwater analyses would be available to the public?* Suzanne said Ecology emphasized state and public review of EIS documents, and it might require asking the agencies' legal representatives what was intended in the MOU. Since EIS scoping is the only opportunity for public comment, Gerry requested a written response from DOE with the list of unreleased documents by next month. Matt said DOE will follow the MOU agreement to meet National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements and Council on Environmental Quality regulations to make sure the process is transparent and lives up to the settlement agreement with Ecology. Suzanne said she does not believe there are any documents left under court seal. Karen Lutz, DOE-RL, said DOE-RL would respond to Gerry's request as quickly as possible.
- Committee issue managers (Gerry, Vince, Susan, and Greg) agreed to examine the settlement agreement, the MOU, previous Board advice, and other documents, to develop expectations for input from the agencies and any questions that arise. They will update the committee in February.

Update on B/C Cribs

Larry Romine, DOE-RL, updated the committee on the status of the B/C Cribs. EPA and DOE-RL have had several meetings to discuss differing perspectives on a path forward for the B/C Cribs. The agencies agreed to look at excavating areas with shallow contaminants, which would eliminate the need to construct a barrier and simplify the institutional controls (ICs) for these areas. The agencies are developing decision-making criteria, such as protectiveness and risk management.

Rod Lobos, EPA, said the dispute between EPA and DOE-RL has been resolved and the agencies are working through issues that come up. EPA expects to move forward quickly with a strategy for the B/C Cribs and have a record of decision (ROD) in place soon.

Committee Discussion

- *Is there a timeline or a target date for the B/C Cribs ROD?* Larry said the agencies are beginning to discuss scheduling issues, which should be developed soon. Barb Wise, Fluor Hanford, said DOE-RL provides a timeline of RODs and other documents at every RAP committee meeting.

- *Have EPA and DOE-RL agreed on a definition of “shallow”?* Larry said the agencies agree conceptually, but an agreed-upon definition does not exist in writing.
- *How have funding reductions impacted remediation of the B/C Cribs?* Larry said that from a funding perspective, the B/C Cribs and four waste sites in the U Area were identified as high priority remediation sites. However, funding of the 200 Area remediation sites has been reduced more than other priorities for several reasons, which has delayed cleanup activities at these sites. Due to the delay, increased data gathering efforts have improved the characterization of several sites and identified sites that need further investigation. Rod said EPA supports additional characterization of some areas, especially those with Technetium 99. Larry said there is limited funding for additional characterization, but there is \$10 million of funding available for the application of new technologies addressing Columbia River contamination. Although the B/C Cribs will not receive funding over the next several years, DOE is providing enough funding to ensure a ROD is prepared and issued.
- There was general committee agreement that the committee should continue to discuss the \$10 million available for technology application relating to Columbia River contamination.
- Dennis said cleanup of the B/C Cribs is a priority for EPA, and EPA does not necessarily agree cleanup work at the B/C Cribs should stop. EPA expects to issue the ROD and that DOE will implement cleanup within the stipulated 15-month remediation period.
- Gerry suggested B/C Cribs funding is an area the committee needs to consider for possible advice. He believes the committee needs to talk about B/C Cribs funding issues in the context of project baseline (PBS) funding and funding for 2007.

Canyon Disposition Initiative (CDI) Record of Decision (ROD)

Larry Romine, DOE-RL, updated the committee on the CDI ROD. DOE-RL is applying funding to the remedial design work plan, and are focusing on options for getting the work started, such as bringing in new cranes, lighting, electrical systems, ventilation, etc. Funding is limited until the River Corridor cleanup is complete. Funding is available between Fiscal Year 2011 through Fiscal Year 2015.

Regulator Perspectives

- Dennis said EPA agrees with DOE regarding the CDI, but a discussion regarding the timing of the work still needs to happen. The ROD will establish a cleanup schedule. Dennis said Central Plateau cleanup activities were set up to conduct some near-term work while the River Corridor cleanup work is going on. He said U Plant, U waste sites, and the B/C Cribs are EPA's short-term cleanup goals.

Committee Discussion

- *What are the hotel costs associated with the CDI?* Larry said hotel costs amount to about \$200,000, but the U Plant Canyon is one of the cheaper canyons.
- *Will the committee have a chance to review the work plans before they are implemented?* Larry said DOE-RL could make arrangements to provide updates on the contents of the work plan; however, a draft version will not be available until next fall.
- *Considering past performance issues, will the experience of laying off trained workers impact decisions made regarding the CDI?* Larry explained that there is not a lot of staff involved. It will be a ramp-up process, so there are no guarantees that workforce experience will be maintained.
- Vince commented that if DOE-RL is working with limited funding for the CDI, it should focus funding on one project instead of spreading limited funding amongst several projects. Larry said DOE has done this, but also has to balance pressures to conduct work on different projects. Dennis said no near-term milestones have been set, and EPA's goal is to reverse the reduced funding trend.

Land Disposal Restrictions (LDR) Materials in the 100 Areas

Chris Smith, DOE-RL, provided an update on LDR materials in the 100 Areas. DOE-RL finished excavation of the 118-B1 site, resulting in the discovery of many anomalies. Chris provided information on the nature of the anomalies, and how Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) and Bechtel have managed their excavation. Craft level workers have instituted several protective measures, which will be integrated into future work in the burial grounds.

Rex Miller, WCH field remediation manager for B/C Area and K Area, provided the committee with a fieldwork update. Cleanup activities involve burial grounds, pipelines, burn pits, and anything that has been identified as a waste site. The TPA milestone for completion of this work is December 2006. Rex said lessons learned are applied as fieldwork progresses. Initially, monitoring efforts were effective, but dangerous for workers. New monitoring efforts were instituted to ensure worker protection. Whenever an anomaly is uncovered during excavation, work stops.

Excavated material is made acceptable for disposal in ERDF. There is a significant amount of unknown material and risks associated with a poor catalogue of information on buried material. WCH works closely with the regulatory agencies to manage unknown materials. Items with high radiation concentration levels are contained and temporarily stored in bunkers. WCH keeps a written inventory of all excavated material.

Committee Discussion

- *What is the risk of an explosion during excavation activities?* Rex said there is no reason to expect an explosion; however, with all the possible unknown material, some potential exists.

- *Greg asked if a list of excavated materials is available?* Rex said WCH keeps a log of everything that goes to ERDF.
- Several committee members emphasized the importance of applying lessons learned. Due to the explosion potential associated with unknown material, Gerry expressed concern that lessons learned are not being applied since WCH is conducting excavation work in the open air and adding water at excavation sites that could drive contamination into the groundwater. Rex explained that the water is applied for dust control, and the moisture does not penetrate more than a few inches at any point. Rex said that whenever fuel is excavated, WCH limits the amount of fuel material stored in each bunker.
- Dennis said he is encouraged by the way the project has adapted. He expects some lessons learned to be developed from an explosion incident at Idaho National Laboratory (INL), which could promote changes to the excavation approach. Findings and recommendations from the INL explosion incident would be available by March.

300 Area D&D Update

Rudy Guercia, DOE-RL, and Mike Swartz, WCH, provided an update on D&D activities at the 300 Area. Rudy described 300 Area D&D field activities, including characterization, demolition, disposition of building waste, and site stabilization. The main driver for 300 Area D&D work is to meet TPA Milestone M-94-05, which requires D&D of the 313 and 314 buildings. D&D of the 313 Building has been completed and D&D of the 314 Building is nearly complete. To date several buildings have been demolished. As work continues, some D&D activities will be subcontracted, for efficiency.

Rudy discussed the initial focus on the northern portion of the 300 Area. An effort is being made to build a backlog of demolished facilities. DOE-RL is in the process of defining an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) for the 324 and 327 buildings. In the southern portion of the 300 Area, DOE-RL is concentrating on maintaining the safety and integrity of the buildings.

Over the next six months, DOE-RL will continue with D&D work in the northern portion of the 300 Area. In addition, DOE-RL will conduct public comment on the Closure Plan for the 324 Building and the change package for TPA Milestone M-89-00. EE/CA #2 for the 324 and 327 buildings will also be issued for public comment in April, and deactivation will begin for the 324 and 327 buildings.

Committee Discussion

- *How does DOE-RL determine how far down to dig during D&D activities?* Rudy said the 300 Area is broken into three sections: 1) North of Alaska Street, 2) the 324 and 327 buildings, and 3) the remainder of the 300 Area. Excavation during facility D&D is determined by depth requirements in an action memorandum. The function

of D&D work is to remove the building in order to deal with the waste site under each building. Some buildings will be demolished to grade and some will be excavated to a depth of one meter.

- *How many below ground tanks are in the 300 Area?* Rudy said there were roughly a couple dozen underground tanks in the 300 Area.
- *Has there been any reconsideration of the Record of Decision made for the sections of the 300 Area that have been demolished to date, i.e., changing cleanup standards from industrial to unrestricted use?* Alicia Boyd, EPA, said no reconsideration of the decisions has been made. Greg suggested the committee track the progress of any reconsideration of D&D decisions made in the 300 Area.

Comprehensive Environmental Responsibility, Liability and Compensation Act (CERCLA) 5-year Review

Karen Lutz, DOE-RL, and Cliff Clark, DOE-RL, updated the committee on the CERCLA 5-year Review. Karen said there was significant interest in the CERCLA 5-year Review workshop, and DOE-RL developed the CERCLA 5-year Review website to capture information from the workshop. The website is available by accessing the public involvement activities section of the Hanford website (<http://www.hanford.gov/?page=182&parent=0>). Karen encouraged the committee to review the content to see if it reflects the information from the CERCLA 5-year Review workshop.

Cliff indicated the preparation of the CERCLA 5-year Review Report is still in progress, but is seriously behind. Information from the CERCLA 5-year Review workshop informed the development of the report. DOE-RL hopes to share the report with the committee at their next meeting, and expects to have a public review of the report with another workshop near the end of February.

Committee Discussion

- Greg commented that the CERCLA 5-year Review workshop was one of the best meetings he has participated in. He expressed concern about EPA's insistence on the CERCLA 5-year Review timeline. He believes it is more important to ensure the quality of the report than timeliness. Dennis said the stipulated completion date for the CERCLA 5-year Review is a statutory date, and will not change. Whether the CERCLA 5-year Review meets the deadline is up to DOE.

Committee Business

- The committee discussed planning for a groundwater field day. During a previous conference call, committee members discussed the need to articulate the Board's groundwater and vadose zone values. Rob Davis was going to review Board advice on groundwater and DOE End States workshops. Committee members were interested in developing a product similar to the Central Plateau Remedial Action

Values Flow path, to determine how to apply the Board's values to the 10 groundwater operable units the agencies requested guidance on.

- Considering the Board plans to provide input during the scoping of the TC&WM EIS and that there are many new Board members, Susan suggested this is a good time for an informational session on groundwater issues. There was general committee agreement that a general groundwater information session is appropriate. Greg commented that a groundwater update is appropriate, but it is important to make people aware of the existing drivers and disconnects between how the TPA agencies perceive groundwater issues. Harold suggested the monthly groundwater meetings provide information on current groundwater issues, which could be part of a general groundwater briefing. Shelley Cimon, Greg, Vince, Todd, Pam, Rob, and Tom Stoops agreed to be issue managers to develop groundwater issues.
- Vince commented that Dennis expressed concern about the Board developing advice on groundwater issues. Maynard said those concerns have been acknowledged and should be addressed.
- Committee requested that Mike Thompson attend the next committee meeting in February. Greg suggested having Dennis present his concerns and disconnects to the next committee meeting. He does not believe Mike Thompson's presentation offers much new information, and it would be more interesting to hear regulators' concerns. Dennis said he could develop his concerns for the committee.
- The committee discussed potential February meeting topics:
 - Groundwater issues, including a discussion of ICs
 - Joint session with BCC on PBS allocations for FY06. Committee expects to ask programmatic questions about what work is being done. Budget handouts will be sent to committee members.
 - TC&WM EIS
 - CERCLA 5-year Review document for review
 - Update on K Basins
 - ICs for completed waste sites
- The committee agreed a conference call was needed on January 17, 2006 at 9:00 a.m.

Action Items / Commitments

- Stacey said she would make the Nuclear Materials Consolidation Committee's charter available to interested committee members.
- Stacey said she would put together some form of the Lay-up Plan, which includes all upgrade and maintenance needs for the PFP, for release to the committee.
- Committee issue managers for the TC&WM EIS (Gerry, Vince, Susan, and Greg) agreed to examine the settlement agreement, the MOU, review previous Board

advice, and other documents, to develop expectations for input from the agencies and any questions that arise. They will update the committee in February.

- Gerry requested a written response from DOE listing the unreleased documents related to the Solid Waste EIS and groundwater analyses by next month. Karen Lutz, DOE-RL, said DOE-RL would respond to Gerry's request as quickly as possible.
- Shelley Cimon, Greg, Vince, Todd, Pam, Rob, and Tom Stoops agreed to be issue managers to develop information on groundwater issues to frame committee discussion.
- Dennis said he could develop his concerns about managing the groundwater operable units for the committee's February meeting.

Handouts

NOTE: Copies of meeting handouts can be obtained through the Hanford Advisory Board Administrator at (509) 942-1906, or tholm@enviroissues.com

- [Letter] Transmittal of Response to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Determination Regarding the U.S. Department of Energy Comment Responses to the Focused Feasibility Study for the BC Cribs and Trenches Area Waste Sites, DOE/RL-2004-66, Draft A, and the Proposed Plan for the BC Cribs and Trenches Area Waste Sites, DOE/RL-2004-69, Draft A, Keith Klein, DOE-RL, December 8, 2005.
- 300 Area D&D Update, Rudy Guercia, DOE-RL, and Mike Swartz, WCH, January 11, 2006.
- 2006 Meetings and Public Comment Periods Timeline, January 10, 2006.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Shelley Cimon	Todd Martin	Mike Priddy
Rob Davis	Debra McBaugh	Dave Rowland
Greg deBruler	Vince Panesko	Dick Smith
Dirk Dunning	Bob Parazin	John Stanfill
Harold Heacock	Gary Peterson	Tom Stoops
Pam Larsen	Maynard Plahuta	Eugene Van Liew
Susan Leckband	Gerry Pollet	Dave Watrous

Others

Dave Brockman, DOE-RL	Rick Bond, Ecology	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
Steve Chalk, DOE-RL	Suzanne Dahl, Ecology	Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz, EnviroIssues
Stacy Charboneau, DOE-RL	Jacqlin Shea, Ecology	Lanny Dusek, FH
Rudy Guercia, DOE-RL	John Price, Ecology	Rob Piippo, FH
Karen Lutz, DOE-RL		Barbara Wise, FH
Matt McCormick, DOE-RL	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Annette Cary, TCH
Larry Romine, DOE-RL	Alicia Boyd, EPA	Lynette Bennett, WCH-RCC

Chris Smith, DOE-RL	Rod Lobos, EPA	Rex Miller, WCH
		Mike Swartz, WCH